

PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

TRANSLATION

From the
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

PCT

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

(PCT Rule 43bis.1)

To:

Date of mailing (day/month/year)	See form PCT/ISA/210
-------------------------------------	-----------------------------

Applicant's or agent's file reference

MFR0187 PCT

FOR FURTHER ACTION

See paragraph 2 below

International application No.

PCT/FR2005/000650

International filing date (day/month/year)

17.03.2005

Priority date (day/month/year)

18.03.2004

International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC

H02K9/19

Applicant

TELMA

1. This opinion contains indications relating to the following items:

- | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--------------|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Box No. I | Basis of the opinion |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Box No. II | Priority |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Box No. III | Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Box No. IV | Lack of unity of invention |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Box No. V | Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Box No. VI | Certain documents cited |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Box No. VII | Certain defects in the international application |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Box No. VIII | Certain observations on the international application |

2. **FURTHER ACTION**

If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA") except that this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notified the International Bureau under Rule 66.1bis(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered.

If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of 3 months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later.

For further options, see Form PCT/ISA/220.

3. For further details, see notes to Form PCT/ISA/220.

Name and mailing address of the ISA/EP

Authorized officer

Facsimile No.

Telephone No.

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No.

PCT/FR2005/000650

Box No. I Basis of this opinion

1. With regard to the language, this opinion has been established on the basis of the international application in the language in which it was filed, unless otherwise indicated under this item.
☐ This opinion has been established on the basis of a translation from the original language into the following language _____, which is the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international search (under Rule 12.3 and 23.1(b)).
2. With regard to any nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence disclosed in the international application and necessary to the claimed invention, this opinion has been established on the basis of:
 - a. type of material
☐ a sequence listing
☐ table(s) related to the sequence listing
 - b. format of material
☐ in written format
☐ in computer readable form
 - c. time of filing/furnishing
☐ contained in the international application as filed.
☐ filed together with the international application in computer readable form.
☐ furnished subsequently to this Authority for the purposes of search.
3. ☐ In addition, in the case that more than one version or copy of a sequence listing and/or table(s) relating thereto has been filed or furnished, the required statements that the information in the subsequent or additional copies is identical to that in the application as filed or does not go beyond the application as filed, as appropriate, were furnished.
4. Additional comments:

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No.

PCT/FR2005/000650

Box No. V	Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement		
1. Statement			
Novelty (N)	Claims	4-7	YES
	Claims	1-3, 8, 9	NO
Inventive step (IS)	Claims		YES
	Claims	1-9	NO
Industrial applicability (IA)	Claims	1-9	YES
	Claims		NO
2. Citations and explanations:			
<p>V.1 The present Application fails to comply with the requirements of PCT Article 33(1) since the subject matter of claims 1-3, 8 and 9 does not meet the requirement of novelty defined in PCT Article 33(2).</p> <p>V.1.1 Document D1 discloses, in figure 4, a length of cooling pipe of constant cross section (a tube) with a one-turn helical conduit 13 designed to be laid alongside part of an electrical machine and two, inlet and outlet, end-fittings 12 and 13 oriented approximately along the direction of the inlet and outlet axes of the conduit, having a slight angular offset. An electrical machine equipped with this length of pipe is also disclosed.</p> <p>The subject matter of claims 1-3 and 9 is therefore not novel.</p> <p>V.1.2 Similar reasoning applies in view of the disclosures in figures 4 and 5 of document D2, the parts 154 and 156 forming the two inlet and outlet end-fittings oriented approximately along the direction of the inlet and outlet axes of the conduit (162).</p>			

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No.

PCT/FR2005/000650

Box No. V

Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability;
citations and explanations supporting such statement

V.1.3 Document D3 discloses, in figure 4, an electrical machine with a length of pipe of constant cross section (a tube) with a conduit (6) and inlet and outlet end-fittings (9) that are oriented **approximately** along the direction of the inlet and outlet axes of the conduit, the conduits being placed in a parallel fashion around the axis of the machine and the end-fittings coaxially with the latter.

The subject matter of claims 1, 8 and 9 is therefore not novel.

V.2 It does not appear that the features of claims 4-7 result in a technical effect that can justify an inventive step over the disclosure of documents D1 and D2. Consequently, the subject matter of claims 4-7 lacks inventive step as defined in PCT Article 33(3).

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No.

PCT/FR2005/000650

Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application

The following observations on the clarity of the claims, description, and drawings or on the question whether the claims are fully supported by the description, are made:

VIII.1 According to the definition given to the expression "conduit" (a part placed alongside part of an electrical machine), the input and output connectors may be defined as input and output elements of the section other than the "conduit". According to this interpretation, and considering the fact that the connectors and the conduit are in communication, it is always correct to state that the connectors are oriented, at least in their part adjacent to the conduit, along the input and output axis of the "conduit", irrespective of the geometry of the connectors (for example a right-angled connector). This feature is not in fact limiting and consequently lacks clarity in view of the problem that the invention proposes to solve (cf. page 5, lines 10-13).

VIII.2 In addition, the term "approximately" used in claim 1 vague and ambiguous, and leaves doubt as to the meaning of the technical feature to which it refers. The subject matter of said claim is therefore not clearly defined (PCT Article 6).

VIII.3 The same object applies to claim 3 and 5 in view of the terms "slight" in claim 3 and "changing" in claim 5.

VIII.4 The expression "conduit **laid** alongside ..." lacks clarity as the subject matter of claim 1 is defined by its position with respect to an element that is external to this object (the electrical machine). The

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No.

PCT/FR2005/000650

Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application

same objection applies to claim 8.

VIII.5 The expression in claim 2 "passing by a circumferential zone" has no clear technical meaning.

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No.

PCT/FR2005/000650

Supplemental Box

In case the space in any of the preceding boxes is not sufficient.

Continuation of:

Boxes V and VIII

Reference is made to the following documents:

D1: GB-A-2 284 943 (HORST FRITZ LENTGE)

21 June 1995 (1995-06-21)

D2: EP-A-0 859 447 (GENERAL ELECTRIC COMPANY)

9 August 1998 (1998-08-19)

D3: EP-A-1 154 548 (BAUMUELLER NUERNBERG GMBH)

14 November 2001 (2001-11-14)